DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 676 32 TM 004 947

AUTHOR Schilling, Sandra Hobson
TITLE A Process Evaluation of Title I Summer In-Services and Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program.
INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Education for the Disadvantaged.
REPORT NO C-74-1
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; *Criterion Referenced Tests; Educational Needs; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Mathematics; *Formative Evaluation; Guidelines; *Inservice Teacher Education; Parochial Schools; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Public Schools; Questionnaires; Summer Programs; Teacher Attitudes; Testing Programs
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Minneapolis Public Schools; Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

The Minneapolis Public School system was awarded an Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I grant. The purpose of these funds was the further development of insights, awareness, competence, and skill toward making living and learning effective for eligible students. Two programs are described: (1) inservice teacher training for the East, North, and West Areas; and (2) a Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program. Evaluation of the inservice program focused on two major concerns: (1) the process of implementing the inservice programs, and (2) the perceived need for the future inservices. Tables provide summaries of participant responses to Title I services and provide a comparison between staff with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the total group, as reflected by the mean rating of desire for more inservice factor. The Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program was developed to: (1) produce a computational math skills testing program, (2) identify Title I children in mathematics, (3) evaluate the progress of Title I children, and (4) evaluate alternative math programs. The report presented here focuses on the development of operational guidelines. (Author/BJG)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED115676

Minneapolis Public Schools

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Process Evaluation of Title I Summer In-Services and Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program

This project was supported with
Title I, Part C, ESEA funds

Sandra Hobson Schilling
An Independent Evaluator Contracted by the
Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

TM 004 947

December 1974
C-74-1

Research and Evaluation Department
Planning and Support Services
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

BOARD OF EDUCATION

W. Harry Davis, Chairman

Frank E. Adams	Mrs. Marilyn A. Borea	Philip A. Olson
Richard F. Allen	John M. Mason	David W. Preus

Superintendent of Schools

John B. Davis, Jr.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Special School District No. 1

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

Minneapolis Public Schools

A Process Evaluation of Title I Summer In-Service and Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program

Summary

See Page

In July, 1974, the Minneapolis Public School System was awarded a $119,010 addendum to its Title I ESEA grant to develop insights, awareness, competance and skill in working with Title I children. The money allocated in this addendum was divided among three project components: (1) Inservice for the East, North and West Areas, (2) a Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program, and (3) a Parochial Reading Workshop for Materials Production for primary level teachers and aides. This report presents a process evaluation of the Summer Inservice Program and the Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program. Because of its similarity to the Parochial Reading Workshop for developing materials for intermediate students the parochial component was not included in this evaluation. 1

Funds in the amount of $101,095 were allocated for 30 hours of inservice training for Title I teachers and aides in the East, North, and West Areas. Evaluation of that inservice program focused on two major concerns: (a) the process of implementing the inservice programs, and (b) the perceived need for future inservices. Process observations of the inservice programs indicated that the project was implemented according to plan. Delay in providing evaluation feedback, failure to begin sessions on time, and overcrowding of some meeting rooms were the major problems identified. In response to the future need for inservice training, results of the opinionnaire administered to project participants revealed a strong relationship between desire for more information in a content area and level of satisfaction with what was presented in that area. Suggestions for future inservice training generally reflected the theme of the inservice for that area. 2 34

The Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program was developed to (a) produce a computational math skills testing program for Title I children in grades K-6, (b) to identify Title I children in mathematics, (c) to evaluate the progress of Title I children and (d) to evaluate alternative math programs. Funds in the amount of $11,132 were allocated to support the project. Because three of the four goals had not been implemented at the writing of this report evaluation presented here focuses on the development of operational guidelines. One important outcome of the evaluation is the identification of issues yet unresolved among project decisionmakers. 36

* * *

December 1974 Research and Evaluation Department

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
TITLE I SUMMER INSERVICE EAST, WEST, AND NORTH AREAS	2
Focus of the Evaluation	2
Project Description	2
Summary of Process Observations	13
Opinionnaire Results	14
North Area	23
West Area	28
Summary of Opinionnaire Results	34
Recommendations	34
MATHEMATICS CRITERION REFERENCED TESTING PROGRAM	36
Focus of the evaluation	36
Project Description	37
Summary of Findings	43
Recommendations	44
Appendix A	45
East, North and West Area Title I, Part C Inservice Opinionnaire	46-51

List of Tables

Number		Page
1	Summary of Participant Responses of the East Area Title I Inservice.	15, 16
2	Comparison of mean ratings of the desire for more inservice factor between East Area participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the mean ratings of the total group.	18, 19
3	Summary of Participant Responses to the North Area Title I Inservice.	24
4	Comparison of mean ratings of the desire for more inservice factor between North Area participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the mean ratings of the total group.	25
5	Summary of Participant Responses to the West Area Title I Inservice.	29
6	Comparison of mean ratings of the desire for more inservice factor between West Area participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the mean ratings of the total group.	30

Listing of Figures

Number		Page
1	Other Suggestions for Future Title I Inservice Training (East Area).	21, 22
2	Other Suggestions for Future Title I Inservice Training (North Area)	27
3	Other Suggestions for Future Title I Inservice Training (West Area).	31, 32

A Process Evaluation of
Title I Summer In-Services and
Mathematics Criterion Referenced
Testing Program

In July, 1974, the Minneapolis Public School System was awarded a $119,010 addendum to the 1973-74 ESEA Title I grant. According to the grant application, the purpose of those additional funds was "the further development of insights, awareness, competence, and skill toward making living and learning effective for students who are eligible for Title I services." The need for this goal was derived from concerns expressed by: (a) the Office of Instruction about the Desegregation/Integration program in elementary schools and from (b) the Office of Planning, Development, and Federal Programs about placement and service to Title I students.

There were three components to the plan for achieving this goal. By far the largest allotment of funds, $101,095, provided for inservice training for professional personnel and aides assigned to work with Title I children during the 1974-75 school year. Each Area was asked to develop a plan to provide thirty hours of inservice training for teachers and aides in that Area. In addition, $11,132 were allocated to develop a Mathematics Criterion-Reference Testing program. Finally, $6,783, were provided to parochial schools for a workshop on producing materials for primary Title I students.

The purpose of this report is to present the results of a process evaluation of the Summer Title I Inservice program and of the Mathematics Criterion-Reference Testing program. The Parochial Reading Workshop for Materials Production was omitted from the evaluation because an identical project with intermediate personnel had been evaluated from January to June, 1974.

For each component evaluated, this report will present:

a. a statement of the focus of the evaluation,

b. a description of the project including detailed operational guidelines,

c. a summary of findings,

d. recommendations for future Title I projects.

TITLE I SUMMER INSERVICE
EAST, WEST, AND NORTH AREAS

Focus of the Evaluation

This evaluation of the Title I Summer Inservice for the East, West, and North Areas focuses on two major concerns: (a) the process of implementing the inservices and (b) the perceived need for future inservices.

The process focus of this evaluation involved first, establishing operational guidelines for each component of the project. Operational guidelines are detailed project plans which delineate specific activities to be completed, anticipated completion dates, and persons responsible. Once developed, operational guidelines serve as the basis for observing project operations to determine whether or not the project is actually implemented according to plan and to identify successes and problems with that implementation.

In addition to this process evaluation, project decision makers requested information about perceived needs for future Title I inservice training. In response to this request, three opinionnaires were developed, one for participants in each of the three areas (See Appendix A). Participants were asked to rate each session they attended according to:

1. Need for knowledge in the content area prior to the in-service
2. Level of satisfaction with what was learned
3. Desire for more inservice in that area

In open ended items participants were also given an opportunity to make additional comments about the inservices and to suggest other topics for future Title I inservices.

This report will present first the process evaluation. It will include a general description of the program, operational guidelines for each component and a summary of process observations. These results of the opinionnaire will be presented for the East Area, the North Area, and the West Area. Based on information presented there, recommendations for future Title I inservices will be made.

Project Description

The purpose of the Title I Summer Inservice Program was "the development of insights, awareness, competance, and skill toward making living and learning effective for students who are eligible for Title I services." Specific goals and objectives for teachers and aides were to be developed by each Area. Funds were allotted for approximately thirty hours of training in

each area. The total inservice program was coordinated by a teacher on special assignment. Specific activities assumed by the project coordinator in the management of the inservices and program plans for each Area are outlined in the operational guidelines that follow.

Title I - Part C In-Service
North, West and East Areas
Summer, 1974

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: Management Page 1

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	RESOURCE ALLOCATION			
	Personnel			
	Selection			
	Select project coordin.		4/16/74	Harry Vakos
	Payment			
	Submit service reports for ... of teachers on special assignment	Every 2 weeks	Every 2 weeks	Paul Larson
	Submit general requisition forms for the payment of teachers and aides participating in inservice	North Area- 8/23/74 West Area- 8/29/74 East Area- 7/19 and 8/30/74	North Area 8/23/74 West Area- 8/29/74 East Area- 7/19 and 8/30/74	Paul Larson
	Budget			
	Maintain project budget	Weekly	Weekly	Paul Larson
	PROJECT PLANNING			
	Identify key decision maker needs and expectations for the workshop Federal projects Office for Instruction Area superintendents Area principals Area teachers		4/17/74	Herb Karsten
	Develop workshop goals		4/17/74	H .b Karsten
	Identify planning committees in each area		5/1/74	aul Larson
	Develop objectives for each session	6/17/74	6/17/74	Paul Larson*
	Select and/or develop activities to meet identified goals and objectives	6/17/74	6/17/74	See Staff Development Component
	Identify necessary resources: Persons and materials	7/1/74	7/1/74	Paul Larson
	Schedule program time and places	7/1/74	7/1/74	Paul Larson

*While Paul Larson was responsible for seeing that programs were developed within each area, other persons were responsible for deciding what those programs should include. Key persons in each area are: East Area: Elmer Koch, Irene Larson, Jean Hudson, Barb Bellair, and Title I principals. West Area: Mildred Carlson, Jean Hudson, Eloise Nelson, Lowery Johnson, Cynthia Tyson, and one teacher from each building. North Area: Mabel Melby, Louise Gorgas, Ruby Riney and Title I principals.

6-27-74

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: Management (continued) Page 2

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Write operational guidelines which specify project activities, persons responsible, and completion dates for each project component.	6/21/74	6/21/74	Sandy Schilling
	Secure consensus about operational guidelines with decision makers		6/30/74	Sandy Schilling Paul Larson
	PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION			
	Physical facilities			
	Make arrangements for physical facilities for each session Buildings # Rooms Seating arrangement Equipment Agendas Coffee	Within 24 hours before each session	Within 24 hours before each session	North Area-Paul Larson East Area-Elmer Koch West Area-Paul Larson
	Program participants			
	Contact each program participant to make sure that he (a) understands his responsibilities and (b) intends to fulfill them	Within 72 hours before each session	Within 72 hours before each session	Paul Larson
	Process Evaluation			
	Observe project to identify discrepancies between actual implementation and project plan. Provide feedback to Larson and Moon.	Between 7/1/74 and 8/31/74	Between 7/1/74 and 8/31/74	Sandy Schilling
	Provide feedback to decision maker questions about the project			
	Identify decision makers information needs	Between 6/24/74 and 7/8/74	Between 6/24/74 and 7/8/74	Sandy Schilling
	Develop data collection instruments	Between 7/1/74 and 8/15/74	Between 7/1/74 and 8/15/74	Sandy Schilling
	Collect data	Between 7/8/74 and 8/28/74	Between 7/8/74 and 8/28/74	Sandy Schilling
	Tabulate data	As available	East area 8/10/74 North and West 11/1/74	Sandy Schilling

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: Management (continued) Page 3

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Feedback results to decision makers requesting information	Within 5 days after data is available	East area: Within 5 days after data was available. North and West area: Within 2 months after data was available.	Sandy Schilling
	Use evaluation feedback to modify project plans.	As needed		Paul Larson
	COMMUNICATION			
	Orientation			
	Inform persons who provide Title I services of the purpose of this project		4/22/74	Herb Karsten
	Inform project coordinator of project purpose and his responsibilities in managing the project		4/16/74	Larry Moon
	Inform planning team of project purpose and their role in planning to meet those needs		East Area- 4/18/74 North Area- 4/22/74 West Area- 4/24/74	Paul Larson
	Inform participants of meeting schedule and objectives		North Area- 5/31/74 West Area- 5/31/74 East Area- 6/4/74	Paul Larson
	Reporting			
	Prepare specific evaluation feedback reports for decision makers who request information	Within 5 days after data is available	11/1/74	Sandy Schilling
	Prepare evaluation report for federal projects office	9/30/74	10/31/74	Sandy Schilling
	Report progress to Parent Advisory Committee		4/17/74 5-15-74 6-19-74	Paul Larson

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

East Area
Component: Staff Development Page 4

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Conduct two three-hour area meetings for Title I teachers and aides to present information about:	7/8/74 and 7/11/74	7/8 and 7/11/74	Paul Larson
	a. Title I services			Larry Moon
	b. Explanation of Title I, use of materials			Larry Moon
	c. IMC			Mitch Trockman
	d. Aides			Don Turkington
	e. Objectives and evaluation			Dick Faunce
	f. Needs assessment			Jean Hudson
	Conduct two three-hour area meetings for Title I teachers and aides to present information about:	7/9/74 and 7/10/74	7/9/74 and 7/10/74	Barbara Bellair
	a. Definition of an individualized approach as a child-centered learning atmosphere			
	b. Organization of the learning environment			
	1. Scheduling 2. Record-keeping, diagnosis 3. Grouping 4. Interest centers 5. Room arrangement			
	c. The teacher as resource			
	1. Inter-relatedness of curriculum areas 2. Conferencing with students 3. Providing motivating learning experiences 4. Effective use of discussion 5. Planning instructional and independent activities			
	Conduct one two-hour area meeting for Title I teachers to present information about:	7/12/74	7/12/74	Peg O'Shaughnessy
	a. Moffett Interaction Program			
	1. Description of program 2. Review of materials 3. Use of materials			

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: East Area Staff Development Page 5

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	b. Language Experience Approach 1. Philosophy 2. Methodology a. Vocabulary-controlled b. Non-controlled vocabulary 3. Implementation			
	Conduct one two-hour area meeting for Title I summary teachers to present information about: a. Testing 1. Mastery tests 2. Informal inventories 3. Learning rate tests 4. Summer school records 5. Teacher judgment b. Interest Survey 1. Interest inventories 2. Conferencing with students	7/15/74	7/15/74	Peg O'Shaughnessy
	Conduct one two-hour area meeting for Title I intermediate teachers to present information about: a. Testing 1. Mastery tests 2. Informal inventories 3. Learning rate tests 4. Summer school records 5. Teacher judgment b. Interest Survey 1. Interest inventories 2. Conferencing with students			
	Conduct one three-hour area meeting for Title I teachers to present information about the following commercial materials: 1. SRA 2. Reader's Digest Skill Builders 3. Wesley Reading Development Kits 4. Comprehension materials purchased during spring, 1974	7/16/74	7/16/74	Peg O'Shaughnessy

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

East Area
Component: Staff Development Page 6

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Conduct one three-hour area meeting for Title I teachers to present information about Comprehension techniques 1. Research review 2. Questioning strategies 3. Using "close" procedures			
	Conduct one three-hour area meeting for teachers and aides to present information about: 1. Math Objectives 2. Assessing math achievement 3. Evaluation	7/17/74	7/17/74	Barb Bellair
	Conduct two forty-five minute area meetings for teachers and aides to present information about commercial math programs a. Games b. Activity cards c. Filmstrips and tapes d. Drill materials	7/18/74	7/18/74	Barb Bellair
	Conduct one forty-five minute area meeting for teachers and aides to present information about classroom organizations: a. Contemporary b. Open c. Continuous Progress d. Early childhood			
	Conduct one two-hour area meeting for teachers and aides to present information about: a. IMC Materials 1. Re-organization of available materials for an individualized program. 2. Development of materials to reinforce basic reading skills in an independent situation b. North Area Materials developed through Part C funds in the spring of 1974			
	and one three-hour area meeting for staff interaction within buildings			Elmer Koch

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: West Area Staff Development Page 7

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Conduct one six hour area meeting for teachers and aides to present information about:	8/21/74	8/21/74	
	a. Title I services			Larry Moon
	b. Explanation of Title I, use of materials			Larry Moon
	c. IMC			Mitch Trockman
	d. Aides			Don Turkington
	e. Objectives and evaluation			Dick Faunce
	f. Needs assessment			Jean Hudson
	Conduct one three and one-half hour area meeting for teachers and aides to present information about:	8/22/74	8/22/74	
	a. Comparative analysis-family styles			Anita Tucker
	b. Value elicitation			Al Sullivan
	Conduct one two and one-half hour meeting for teachers and aides to present information about:	8/22/74	8/22/74	
	a. Survival strategies			Al Sullivan
	1. Behavior 2. Language 3. Psychology			
	b. Assessment procedures and their implications for schooling			John Taborn
	Conduct one six hour area meeting for teachers and aides to:	8/23/74	8/23/74	
	a. Have community-teacher dialogue			Al Sullivan
	b. Present information about concept of self concept			Al Sullivan
	c. Present information about behavioral objectives and self concept			Al Sullivan

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

West Area
Component: Staff Development Page 8

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Conduct one three and one-half hour area meeting for teachers and aides to:	8/26/74	8/26/74	
	a. Observe Title I materials display			Irene Larson
	b. Present information about a strate[illegible] for talking to and with childre[illegible]			Bob McCawley
	c. Present information about [illegible]ective behavioral objectives			Bob McCawley
	Conduct individual building meetings (nine hours)	8/26/74-afternoon 8/27/74-all day	8/26/74-afternoon 8/27/74-all day	Building principals

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: North Area Staff Development Page 9

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Conduct one six hour area meeting for teachers and aides to present information about:	8/19/74	8/19/74	
	a. Title I services			Larry Moon
	b. Explanation of Title I, use of materials			Larry Moon
	c. IMC			Mitch Trockman
	d. Aides			Don Turkington
	e. Objectives and evaluation			Dick Faunce
	f. Needs assessment			Ruby Riney
	Aides and teachers, grouped by building clusters, will participate in five mini courses:	8/20 and 8/21/74	8/20 and 8/21/74	
	a. Orientation of the Title I child			Sharon Buckner
	b. Assessing reading and math			Louise Gorgas
	c. One of the following two choices:			
	1. Perceptual motor development 2. Teachers aides			Carolyn Papke Don Turkington
	d. One of the following two choices:			
	1. Self awareness-self concept-process approach			Mabel Melby
	2. Learning materials			Christine Carr
	Provide twelve hours for individual building meetings	Hay cluster-7/27 7/28/74 Lowell-Hawthorne-7/22 7/23/74 Cleveland cluster 8/22 and 8/23/74 Putnam 8/27/74 Bethune cluster 8/22 and 8/23/74	Hay 7/27 7/28/74 Lowell-Hawthorne-7/22 7/23/74 Cleveland-8/22 and 8/23/74 Putnam 8/27/74 Bethune 8/22 and 8/23/74	Building principals

Summary of Process Observations

Observations of the Summer Title I In-service Program indicate that for the most part, the project was implemented according to plan. Persons responsible for organizing and developing the various program components carried out the assigned activities on schedule. Likewise, persons responsible for arranging facilities and presenting inservice programs performed according to plan. In fact, the only discrepancy with the operational guidelines seemed to be in the schedule of providing evaluation feedback to project decision makers.

Two factors are primarily responsible for this delay in providing evaluation feedback. Data from the North and West Areas could not be collected until the last week of the project evaluator's contract. Also, the request to make this report a formal one required more than the 80 hours the evaluator had negotiated for providing feedback. Even after this manuscript is submitted additional delay will be required for the typing, editing and approving process.

Besides the discrepancy with the project plan for reporting evaluation results, two problems were observed which should be noted here. Failure to begin on time was a problem observed throughout many of the inservice sessions. Participants wandering into sessions up to an hour late both morning and noon and coffee breaks that sometimes extended for twenty to thirty minutes were common occurrances in the East Area, but particularly in the North Area inservice sessions. The problem was less apparent in the West Area where the meeting space was more confined and where breaks were less frequent.

A second problem, unavoidable perhaps, but a problem nonetheless, is the situation that arises when meeting participants are given free choice of what sessions to attend. There were instances in both the East and North Areas where some sessions were standing room only and others were attended only meagerly.

Before concluding this summary of process observations, it seems appropriate to consider one final point regarding the development of operational guidelines for inservice sessions. While the guidelines that were developed for the management component may have been helpful in assuring that all bases were covered and that everyone knew the players, there may be some question about the usefulness of the guidelines that were developed for each Area inservice. Information for those three components was simply copied from the meeting programs.

What seems important is that detailed plans are formulated for each inservice, not the form they take. Further, it seems that little can be

learned by simply checking off, "yes or no," whether or not each agenda item is covered. Unless qualitative or quantitative criteria are built into the operational guidelines for inservice sessions, their usefulness is surely open to serious criticism.

Opinionnaire Results:

The purpose of this section is to present some answers to the question, "what are the needs for future Title I inservice training?" The source of data for consideration is participant responses to opinionnaire administered at the conclusion of the East, the North, and the West Area Title I summer inservices. Responses will be summarized for each content area or topic covered according to three factors: (1) need for knowledge prior to the inservice, (2) level of satisfaction with what was learned, and (3) desire for more inservice in that content area. The mean response (scale 1-very low to 5-very high) as well as the frequency of response at the various points on the scale will be given for each factor within each topic. Significant comparisons will be noted both among factors within a topic and among topics. In addition, comparisons in responses to the desire for more information factor will be made between participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the Total group. Finally, other suggestions for future Title I inservice training will be summarized.

East Area. Responses to the opinionnaire of the East Area Title I inservice were obtained from 102 teachers, 46 aides, 16 parents, and 3 administrators or supervisors, a total of 167 persons. This rate of response is consistent with the average daily attendance at the East area inservice sessions.

Data describing total group response to the opinionnaire are presented in Table 1. Results there indicate that mean ratings in the need for knowledge factor vary from 2.4 for two topics (Services of the Federal Projects Office and Explanation of Title I) to 3.6 for Interest surveys and Diagnostic Tools for Intermediate Students. Mean ratings in level of satisfaction vary from 2.0 for Dr. DeVault's presentation on Strategies and Systems for Individualizing Reading Instruction to 3.9 for the presentation on Films and Tapes for mathematics instruction. Similarly mean ratings in desire for more inservice vary from 1.9 for services of the Federal Projects Office and Explanation of Title I to 3.6 for the mathematics presentation of Games (See and Play).

Table 1

Summary of Participant Responses
to the East Area Title I Inservice

July 8 to July 18, 1974

Participants: 102 teachers
46 aides
16 parents
3 other

Total Participants: 167

Content Area	Need for Knowledge						Level of Satisfaction						Desire for more in-service					
	Mean Rating	Frequency					Mean Rating	Frequency					Mean Rating	Frequency				
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Services of Federal Projects Office 7/8*	2.4	51	23	41	19	11	2.6	26	33	71	11	6	1.9	68	28	36	6	4
Explanation of Title I 7/8*	2.4	43	30	47	18	8	2.8	24	26	69	19	11	1.9	73	27	35	4	5
Current Title I projects 7/8*	2.6	31	32	45	27	8	2.9	16	29	69	19	12	2.1	63	20	40	13	5
Use of Title I materials 7/8*	2.7	32	30	41	29	11	2.9	19	19	70	28	9	2.4	50	18	41	19	10
Instructional Materials Center (IMC) 7/8*	2.7	34	27	44	26	13	3.0	20	18	63	28	15	2.5	46	24	34	20	16
The aides' program 7/8*	2.5	39	27	40	23	9	2.9	17	26	57	28	11	2.2	64	24	22	15	11
Title I objectives and evaluation 7/11*	2.6	36	27	55	14	12	2.8	20	25	71	20	10	2.2	53	31	39	10	8
Title I needs assessment 7/11*	2.6	36	29	44	26	7	2.8	19	25	75	16	8	2.2	61	21	39	11	7
Dr. M. Vere DeVault's presentation on Strategies and Systems for Individualizing Reading Instruction 7/9	3.3	24	15	34	35	33	2.0	60	42	33	9	1	2.7	40	17	48	28	15
Language experience techniques for primary children 7/12	3.1	9	8	22	15	8	3.4	6	8	19	15	15	3.2	5	10	24	15	8
Language experience techniques for intermediate children 7/12	3.2	3	4	15	6	7	3.3	1	4	16	10	4	3.2	5	5	10	9	6
Moffett interaction program for primary children 7/12	3.4	5	5	8	5	13	3.5	0	7	13	9	8	3.1	5	6	13	6	6
Moffett interaction for intermediate children 7/12	3.4	2	4	9	7	6	2.8	3	5	15	4	1	3.4	2	4	9	7	6
Interest surveys and diagnostic tools for primary students 7/15	3.4	4	6	30	15	13	3.3	2	13	27	17	9	2.8	9	16	31	6	7
Interest surveys and diagnostic tools for intermediate students 7/15	3.6	2	1	16	11	8	3.3	2	3	17	13	3	2.9	5	12	9	5	7
Commercial reading materials 7/16	3.0	6	10	28	12	6	3.0	6	11	25	14	6	2.7	11	14	21	10	4
Reading comprehension techniques 7/16	3.5	3	4	28	18	13	3.4	4	7	27	17	11	3.3	3	8	28	20	6

Note: In some cases sessions were presented simultaneously so that participants had a choice of sessions they attended.

*Aides were invited to participate in these sessions.

Table 1

(Continued)

Summary of Participant Responses
to the East Area Title I Inservice

Content Area	Need for Knowledge						Level of Satisfaction						Desire for more in-service					
	Mean Rating	Frequency					Mean Rating	Frequency					Mean Rating	Frequency				
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Dr. M. Vere DeVault's presentation on Strategies for Individualizing Math Instruction 7/10 *	3.4	20	12	36	37	34	2.3	42	45	32	18	3	3.0	25	20	41	27	19
CGAM and CAI as tools for individualizing 7/10 *	3.2	10	11	19	17	13	2.9	11	9	32	12	7	3.1	13	8	23	15	12
Using diagnosis kits to assist in individualizing the Houghton Mifflin Math program 7/10 *	3.5	7	10	31	22	22	3.2	7	13	38	29	8	3.0	13	16	33	20	10
An example of how an individualized math program functions 7/10 *	3.4	8	7	32	21	18	3.0	9	15	35	23	6	3.2	8	13	31	23	13
An example of an assessment tool to use in the individualizing process 7/10 *	3.2	7	6	30	16	10	3.0	6	11	36	11	7	2.8	11	14	29	13	4
How to write behavioral objectives 7/17 *	3.1	23	17	42	31	23	3.2	12	19	54	35	16	2.6	33	31	34	24	11
Critiquing objectives from various sources 7/17 *	2.9	17	11	32	19	10	3.0	11	17	38	17	9	2.6	25	12	31	14	7
Games (Say and Play) 7/18 *	3.4	11	12	43	35	21	3.6	6	9	38	45	26	3.6	13	8	28	39	34
Activity cards (See and Do) 7/18 *	3.5	8	7	31	27	21	3.7	2	8	31	31	22	3.4	8	11	31	25	21
Films and tapes (See and Hear) 7/18 *	3.5	5	5	26	23	16	3.9	2	2	20	34	19	3.3	9	11	22	15	18
Drill materials (Write and Practice) 7/18 *	3.1	6	6	8	9	7	2.7	6	12	7	7	3	3.2	8	6	7	3	13

Attempting now to summarize the data presented there, several patterns seem to emerge:

1. Sessions presented by the Federal Projects office received consistently lower ratings in need for knowledge prior to the inservice, in level of satisfaction with what was learned, and in desire for more inservice in that content area than other sessions. From 40 to 50 per cent of the participants expressed very little to little need for inservice in that content area prior to the inservice.

2. The sessions on materials for teaching mathematics (Games, Activity Cards, Films and Tapes, and Drill Materials) received generally higher ratings across the three functions than other sessions.

3. In general, the mean level of response to the factors within a content area were fairly consistent across the three factors. A high level of satisfaction was nearly always accompanied by high need for knowledge and high desire for more information. One exception to this trend was Dr. DeVaults presentations on Individualizing Reading Instruction and Individualizing Math Instruction. In both cases the need for knowledge factor was rated between average and high while the level of satisfaction was low for reading and between low and average for math. Desire for more information in that content was about average in both cases.

4. While the mean ratings do not reflect a strong desire for additional training in any of the content areas included in this inservice, some persons did express high to very high desire for more information. Areas where most persons expressed such a desire are the IMC (36 persons), individualizing reading instruction (43 persons), individualizing math instruction (46 persons), writing Behavior Objectives (35 persons), Games for teaching math (72 persons), and activity cards for teaching math (46 persons).

Table 2 presents a comparison of responses to the desire for more inservice factor between participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the total group. What is most significant about this data is the difference in responses to content presented by the Federal Projects Office. Persons with little or no experience in Title I expressed considerably higher desire for more inservice in those content areas than the total group of participants. That trend did not hold for other content areas presented during the inservice.

Table 2

Comparison of mean ratings of the desire for more inservice factor between East Area participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the mean ratings of the total group.

Content Area	Desire for more inservice	
	Participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children N=38	Total group N=167
Services of Federal Projects Office 7/8	2.6	1.9
Explanation of Title I 7/8	2.4	1.9
Current Title I projects 7/8	2.8	2.1
Use of Title I materials 7/8	3.3	2.4
Instructional Materials Center (IMC) 7/8	3.4	2.5
The aides' program 7/8	2.9	2.2
Title I objectives and evaluation 7/11	2.8	2.2
Title I needs assessment 7/11	2.5	2.2
Dr. M. Vere DeVault's presentation on Strategies and Systems for Individualizing Reading Instruction 7/9	2.9	2.7
Language experience techniques for primary children 7/12	2.7	3.2
Language experience techniques for intermediate children 7/12	3.7	3.2
Moffett interaction program for primary children 7/12	2.7	3.1
Moffett interaction for intermediate children 7/12	3.4	3.4
Interest surveys and diagnostic tools for primary students 7/15	2.9	2.8
Interest surveys and diagnostic tools for intermediate students 7/15	3.2	2.9

Table 2
(Continued)

Content Area	Desire for more inservice	
	Participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children N=38	Total group N=167
Commercial reading materials 7/16	2.5	2.7
Reading comprehension techniques 7/16	3.6	3.3
Dr. M. Vere DeVault's presentation on Strategies for Individualizing Math Instruction 7/10	3.0	3.0
CGAM and CAI as tools for individualizing the Houghton Mifflin Math program 7/10	3.5	3.1
Using diagnosis kits to assist in individualizing the Houghton Mifflin Math program 7/10	3.0	3.0
An example of how an individualized math program functions 7/10	3.3	3.2
An example of an assessment tool to use in the individualizing process 7/10	2.9	2.8
How to write behavioral objectives 7/17	2.2	2.6
Critiquing objectives from various sources 7/17	2.6	2.6
Games (Say and Play) 7/18	4.0	3.6
Activity cards (See and Do) 7/18	3.5	3.4
Films and tapes (See and Hear) 7/18	3.4	3.3
Drill materials (Write and Practice) 7/18	3.3	3.2

Listed in Figure 1 are other suggestions for future Title I inservice training in the East Area. While no single need is apparent in the data there, most suggestions tend to be related to classroom instruction and materials. It is interesting to note, too, that three aides from Seward suggested training in reading. Aides did not participate in the inservice sessions on reading.

Figure 1

Other Suggestions for Future Title I
Inservice Training (East Area)

Clinton
1. Aide-teacher-administrator roles and responsibilities (T)[1]
2. Organizing a classroom day (T)
3. Working with various group sizes (T)
4. Time to prepare materials (T)
5. Talking typewriter and Basic Skills Center (T)
6. Coping with behavior problems (T)
7. Title I Needs Assessment (T)
8. Title I Resources (T)
9. Title I Needs Assessment (T)

Corcoran
10. Individualizing reading and math (T)
11. Individualizing with the ABC materials (T)
12. Individualizing with the ABC materials (T)
13. Social studies (T)
14. Role of Title I supplemental teacher (T)
15. Discipline (T)
    Science (T)
    Social studies (T)
16. Use of visual aides

Greeley
17. Working with MR and SLBP (A)[2]
18. Activities for use within skill areas

Longfellow
19. Working with aides (T)
20. Title I: regulations, program administration, materials available (T)
21. Management of children-for aides (T)
22. Reading materials-for aides (T)
23. Title I materials (T)
    Time to construct materials (T)
    Games for children (T)
24. Juggling funds to get the most for the Title I child (T)
25. Time to construct materials (T)

Northrop
26. Materials development (T)

Seward
27. Metric system (A)
28. Reading (A)
29. Reading (A)[3]
30. Reading (P)[3]
31. Reading (A)
32. Assessing and prescribing for children in continous progress (T)
33. Coping with Title I Behavior Problems (T)

Standish
34. IMC materials (T)
    Math materials (T)

1 T=response of participating teacher
2 A=response of participating aide
3 P=response of participating parent

Whittier

35. Individualization (T)
36. Management of children, especially for aides (T)
37. Time to make a math kit (T)
    Painting (T)
    Creativity in story telling (T)
38. Behavior modification (T)
39. Social studies (T)
40. CAI math (T)

North Area. Responses to the opinionnaire of the North Area Title I inservice were obtained from 82 teachers, 49 aides, and 4 parents, a total of 135 persons. The rate of response here is approximately 50 percent.

Data describing the total group response to the opinionnaire are presented in Table 3. Results there indicate that mean ratings in the need for knowledge factor vary from 2.6 for two topics (Services of Federal Projects and Explanation of Title I) to 3.8 for the session on Perceptual Motor Development. Mean ratings in the level of satisfaction vary from 2.7 with the session on Title I Needs Assessment to 4.0 for Perceptual Motor Development. Mean ratings in desire for inservice also varied from a low 1.7 for Explanation of Title I to 3.8 for Perceptual Motor Development.

Summarizing the data presented here, several trends seem apparent.

1. Sessions presented by the Federal Projects Office received somewhat lower ratings in need for knowledge prior to the inservice, in level of satisfaction with what was learned, and with desire for more inservice than other sessions. Between 30 and 40 percent of the participants expressed very little to little need for knowledge in that content area prior to the inservice.
2. The sessions on self-concept and Perceptual Motor Development received higher ratings than other sessions.
3. While mean ratings do not reflect a strong desire for more training in any content area included in this inservice, some persons did express a high to very high desire for more information. Areas where most persons expressed this desire are assessing without threatening (26 persons), learning materials that motivate and encourage (26 persons), Self-concept, (25 persons), Perceptual Motor Development (40 persons), and Developing a Successful Teacher and Aide Team (28 persons).

Table 4 presents a comparison of responses to the desire for more inservice factor between participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the total group. While differences are small and somewhat inconsistent, persons with experience working with Title I children express slightly higher desires for more informations in these content areas than their inexperienced counterparts.

Table 3

Summary of Participant Responses to the North Area Title I Inservice

July 8 to July 18, 1974

Participants: 82 teachers
49 aides
4 parents
0 other

Total Participants: 135

Content Area	Need for Knowledge							Level of Satisfaction							Desire for more in-service					
	Mean Rating	Frequency						Mean Rating	Frequency						Mean Rating	Frequency				
		1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5
Services of Federal Projects Office	2.6	25	26	28	20	8		2.8	16	17	55	16	4		1.9	51	23	18	6	2
Explanation of Title I	2.6	24	33	31	17	8		3.0	14	17	50	32	7		1.7	60	23	13	6	1
Use of Title I materials 7/8	2.7	23	24	32	20	10		3.0	13	13	57	26	7		2.3	37	23	20	20	3
Instructional Materials Center (IMC)	2.8	23	16	31	22	11		3.1	9	12	52	26	9		2.4	31	16	31	15	4
The aides' program	3.0	17	19	29	19	15		3.2	10	9	44	27	11		2.4	34	17	21	12	9
Title I objectives and evaluation	2.7	23	21	35	16	8		2.9	15	13	52	19	9		1.9	46	20	20	8	1
Current Title I Projects	2.7	17	23	35	15	8		2.8	16	14	52	19	4		2.2	35	21	24	12	1
Title I needs assessment	2.7	20	20	37	18	7		2.7	18	15	58	12	5		2.2	34	20	25	11	3
Orientation to the Title I child	2.8	26	18	34	18	14		2.8	26	17	41	26	9		2.3	40	21	23	12	7
Assessing without threatening: Reading and Math	3.0	17	11	44	21	14		2.9	11	21	58	18	8		2.6	27	17	32	18	8
Learning materials that motivate and encourage	3.2	11	6	35	24	11		3.3	8	8	37	31	9		2.7	23	10	24	18	8
Self-concept: A process approach	3.3	6	2	35	17	8		3.6	7	1	24	18	19		3.1	12	4	25	13	12
Perceptual motor development	3.8	3	3	17	17	18		4.0	2	1	15	17	24		3.8	3	4	11	22	18
Developing a successful teacher and aide team	3.3	13	7	25	24	17		3.1	11	9	38	27	6		2.8	19	18	18	17	11

Table 4

Comparison of mean ratings of the desire for more inservice factor between North Area participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the mean ratings of the total group.

Content Area	Desire for more inservice	
	Participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children N=41	Total group N=135
Services of Federal Projects Office	1.7	1.9
Explanation of Title I	1.7	1.7
Use of Title I materials 7/8	1.8	2.3
Instructional Materials Center (IMC)	2.5	2.4
The aides' program	2.4	2.4
Title I objectives and evaluation	2.1	1.9
Current Title I Projects	2.1	2.2
Title I needs assessment	2.3	2.2
Orientation to the Title I child	2.2	2.3
Assessing without threatening: Reading and Math	2.4	2.6
Learning materials that motivate and encourage	2.7	2.7
Self-concept: A process approach	2.5	3.1
Perceptual motor development	3.5	3.8
Developing a successful teacher and aide team	2.8	2.8

Listed in Figure 2 are other suggestions for future Title I inservice training in the North Area. While no single need is apparent in the data there, most suggestions tend to be related to aide-teacher roles and responsibilities perceptual motor development, or motivating students.

Figure 2

Other Suggestions for Future Title I
Inservice Training (North Area)

Bethune
1. Psychology (A)[1]
2. Inservice for aides (A)

Cleveland
3. Aides roles and responsibilities (T)[2]
4. Aide-teacher roles and responsibilities (T)
5. Aide-teacher roles and responsibilities (T)

Hall
6. New methods of presenting material to students (A)
7. Aide-teacher roles and responsibilities (T)
8. Testing vision (T)
9. Title I Needs Assessment Form (T)

Hawthorne
10. Coping with behavior problems (A)
    Aide-teacher roles and responsibilities (A)

Holland
11. Perceptual motor development (T)
12. Materials that motivate (T)
    Adlerian psychology (T)

Lincoln
13. New developments from the government (T)
14. Reading (T)
15. Effective uses of tapes (T)

Webster
16. Use of audiovisual material (A)
17. Self-confidence (T)
    Self-discipline (T)
18. Adlerian psychology (T)
19. Perceptual motor development (T)
    Individualization (T)
    Diagnosing reading and math needs (T)
20. Reading materials
21. Instructional materials for the specialist: P.E., Art, and Music (T)

School Unassigned
22. Use of A-V equipment (A)

[1] A=response of a participating aide

[2] T=response of a participating teacher

West Area. Responses to the opinionnaire of the West Area Title I inservice were obtained from 80 teachers, 47 aides, 3 parents, and 9 administrators or supervisors, a total of 139 persons. This rate of response is consistent with the average daily attendance at the East Area inservice sessions.

Data describing total group responses to the opinionnaire are presented in Table 5. Results there indicate that mean ratings in the need for knowledge factor vary from 2.3 for the session on the Explanation of Title I to 3.4 for Affective Behavioral Objectives. Response to the level of satisfaction vary from 2.3 for Title I Needs Assessment to 3.7 for the Concept of Self-Concept. In the desire for more inservice factor responses vary from 1.8 for Services of the Federal Projects Office and Explanation of Title I to 3.4 for the sessions on Survival Techniques of Students and Affective Behavorial Objectives.

Summarizing the data here, several patterns seem to emerge:

1. Although the variance between low and high mean ratings is fairly small, it is apparent that sessions presented by the Federal Projects Office received consistently lower ratings in need for knowledge prior to the inservice, in level of satisfaction with what was learned, and in desire for more inservice than other sessions. From 43 to 50 per cent of the participants expressed very little to little need for information in that content area prior to the inservice.
2. Sessions entitled, The Black Family, Survival Techniques of Students, The Concept of Self-Concept, Behavioral Objectives, The Life Space Interview, and Affective Behavioral Objectives were rated equally and somewhat higher than the others.
3. The mean ratings reported here reflect from average to low desire for additional training in these content areas. However, some persons did express high to very high desires for more information in each content area. Areas where most persons expressed such desire include: Survival Techniques of Students (52 persons), The Concept of Self Concept (54 persons), Behavior Objectives (50 persons), The Life Space Interview (50 persons), and Affective Behavioral Objectives (60 persons).

Table 6 presents a comparison of responses to the desire for more inservice factor between participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the total group. What is significant about the data presented here is the difference content presented by the Federal Projects Office. Persons with little or no experience in Title I expressed somewhat higher desire for more inservice in those content areas than the total group of participants. There was little difference between responses to the remaining content areas.

Listed in Figure 3 are other suggestions for Title I Inservice training

Table 5

Summary of Participant Responses to the West Area Title I Inservice

July 8 to July 18, 1974

Participants: 80 teachers
47 aides
3 parents
9 other

Total Participants: 139

Content Area	Need for Knowledge						Level of Satisfaction						Desire for more in-service					
	Mean Rating	Frequency					Mean Rating	Frequency					Mean Rating	Frequency				
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Services of Federal Projects Office	2.4	44	20	32	19	6	2.5	33	25	42	22	2	1.8	64	19	21	7	3
Explanation of Title I	2.3	38	30	32	15	6	2.7	30	21	43	27	5	1.8	66	18	26	3	2
Use of Title I materials	2.5	38	23	31	23	5	2.5	35	22	41	25	2	2.2	51	18	25	15	5
Instructional Materials Center (IMC)	2.4	39	25	29	19	7	2.7	24	21	49	27	5	2.0	56	17	30	10	2
The aides' program	2.5	36	27	32	17	9	2.5	35	21	46	21	4	2.0	55	24	26	7	4
Title I objectives and evaluation	2.4	38	25	31	20	7	2.6	26	28	44	24	3	2.0	54	20	29	8	4
Current Title I Projects	2.5	37	22	40	12	9	2.5	33	22	51	18	1	1.9	59	20	26	6	5
Title I needs assessment	2.4	39	22	30	15	9	2.3	34	29	40	15	1	2.1	50	18	27	7	6
The black family, a comparative analysis	3.2	14	12	46	30	17	3.6	7	9	43	39	28	3.1	18	16	40	22	19
Value elicitation experience	3.0	12	11	55	22	8	3.4	9	5	55	25	20	2.8	22	12	41	16	12
Survival techniques of students	3.3	6	15	52	27	16	3.6	4	5	50	37	28	3.4	10	11	40	31	21
Socio-metric techniques for schools	3.0	10	17	44	18	9	3.2	9	12	47	20	16	3.0	13	17	33	23	9
Community-Parent Teacher-Dialogue	2.9	21	14	45	24	13	2.6	37	23	29	21	13	3.0	26	11	32	21	23
The concept of self-concept	3.2	8	14	56	28	14	3.7	3	6	46	41	30	3.3	16	9	37	31	23
Behavioral objectives	3.2	8	14	54	26	15	3.5	3	10	57	29	23	3.3	12	9	42	31	19
The life space interview	3.3	9	7	63	23	19	3.6	5	9	52	33	28	3.2	16	11	41	28	22
Affective behavioral objectives	3.4	6	13	49	33	18	3.5	5	8	54	36	23	3.4	13	9	34	36	24

Table 6

Comparison of mean ratings of the desire for more inservice factor between West Area participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children and the mean ratings of the total group.

Content Area	Desire for More Inservice	
	Participants with less than one year or no experience with Title I children N=28	Total group N=139
Services of Federal Projects Office 7/8	2.2	1.8
Explanation of Title I	1.9	1.8
Use of Title I materials 7/8	2.7	2.2
Instructional Materials Center (IMC) 7/8	2.4	2.0
The aides' program 7/8	2.5	2.0
Title I objectives and evaluation 7/11	2.5	2.0
Current Title I Projects	2.3	1.9
Title I needs assessment 7/11	2.6	2.1
The black family, a comparative analysis	3.0	3.1
Value elicitation experience	2.8	2.8
Survival techniques of students	3.4	3.4
Socio-metric techniques for schools	3.0	3.0
Community-Parent Teacher-Dialogue	2.5	3.0
The concept of self-concept	3.0	3.3
Behavioral objectives	2.9	3.3
The life space interview	3.4	3.2
Affective behavioral objectives	3.3	3.4

Figure 3

Other Suggestions for Future Title I
Inservice Training (West Area)

Bryn Mawr

1. Use of Title I materials (T)[1]
   Aide roles and responsibilities (T)
2. Developing materials (T)
   Coping with behavior problems (T)
3. Native American and Chicano ethnic backgrounds(T)
4. Self-concept (T)
   Conflict resolution (T)
5. Title I materials (T)

Calhoun

6. Teacher-aide roles and relationships (A)[2]
7. Teacher-aide roles and relationships (A)
8. Spanish surname and Native American cultures (A)

Harrison

9. Coping with behavior problems (A)
10. Title I materials (A)
11. Title I Needs Assessment (T)
12. IMC and Title I materials (T)
13. Title I Needs Assessment (T)
14. Focusing on verbal and writing skills for black children without discrediting their own language (T)

Kenwood

15. Indian culture (Other)
16. Helping children of different races get along.

Lyndale

17. Teacher-teacher relations (T)
    Functions of social worker vs. school counselor. (T)
18. Title I materials
19. Coping with behavior problems (A)
20. Coping with behavior problems (A)
21. Black-white life styles-attitudes (A)
    Attitudes toward school administrators. (A)
    Black family analysis (A)

West Area Intermediate Center

22. Title I Needs Assessment (T)
23. Self-concept (T)
    Outdoor education (T)
24. Student interaction (Minority/Majority) (A)
    Building a multi ethnic curriculum (A)
    Building trust (Majority/Minority) (A)
25. Title I materials
    Coping with behavior problems

Not assigned to one school

26. Coping with conflict (T)
27. Title I Needs Assessment (T)
    Diagnosing special learning problems (T)
28. Coping with behavior problems (T)

1 T=response of participating teacher
2 A=response of participating aide

29. Coping with behavior problems (T)
30. Coping with behavior problems (T)
    Parent-teacher communications

in the West Area. Suggestions tend to focus on understanding ethnic backgrounds and interactions and coping with behavior problems.

Summary of Opinionnaire Results. Overall, results of the opinionnaire were fairly consistent among the three areas. Mean ratings of the need for knowledge factor ranged between low-average (2.3 on a 5 point scale) and high-average (3.8) means for the level of satisfaction factor ranged from low-average (2.3) to high (4.0), and means of the desire for more information factor ranged from very low-low (1.7) to high-average (3.8). Sessions presented by the Federal Projects Office received consistently lower ratings than other sessions. In each instance there seemed to be a high per cent of participants who felt very little or little need for inservice in that content area. In both the East and West Areas persons with little or no experience with Title I children rated the Title I sessions higher than the total group. Although the mean ratings for the need for more inservice factor did not reflect a strong need for more training in any one content area, some persons did express a high to very high need for more inservice. For items marked by the rating scale, expression of need for additional inservice seemed to be highly correlated with the level of satisfaction with a session. Similarly, suggestions for future inservice training presented in the open ended items generally reflected the theme of the inservice for that Area.

Recommendations

From the information presented here a number of recommendations seem appropriate for consideration when planning future Title I inservice.

1. The general dissatisfaction with the Federal Projects presentations evidenced here seems to indicate that:
   a. Some alternative should be provided when the content to be included is likely to be repetitious for many participants, and that
   b. Classroom teachers should be involved in committees to plan inservice sessions.
2. Because of the strain tardiness imposes on meeting schedules and the disruption caused by numerous late arrivals, some attempt should be made to begin inservice sessions on time.

   While no one solution is obvious, some possible alternatives are:

   a. Using a microphone to announce the beginning of sessions.
   b. Penalties in reimbursement for unreasonably late arrivals.
   c. Holding meetings in more confined areas
   d. Fewer coffee breaks
   e. Scheduling ample time for participants to have lunch during all-day sessions.
3. In cases where participants are given choice of sessions, uncomfortable overcrowding of space might be avoided if a preliminary count of intention were made and locations (from a number of alternatives) assigned on that basis.

4. Since operational guidelines for the North, the West, and the East Area Staff Development components involved simply transferring details from the program plan to the format of operational guidelines, and since no qualitative or quantitative criteria were established for observing implementation, it seems reasonable to recommend that this task be eliminated. However, the development of guidelines for the management or coordination should be maintained.
5. Timely reporting of results is an essential criterion of effective evaluation. Because the process of communicating results via formal project reports is a laborious and time consuming task, and because few persons probably take the time to wade through such reports, some attention should be given to streamlining this report process.

MATHEMATICS CRITERION REFERENCED TESTING PROGRAM

Focus of the Evaluation

Consistent with the original Title I, Part C, grant application, the primary focus of this evaluation is on the process of implementing the Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program, not on the outcomes of that program.

By way of background information, the purpose of the process evaluations implemented for Part C projects was to determine whether or not projects were implemented according to the proposal and to identify specific problems and successes with their implementation. That process involved four steps:

1. Establishing operational guidelines for the project. Operational guidelines are specific project plans which identify the major components of a project, specific activities which must be completed within each component, persons responsible for those activities and anticipated completion dates or frequencies. They are developed cooperatively by the project coordinator and the evaluator. However, each person with responsibility for the project is given an opportunity for input. The guidelines are completed only when persons responsible reach consensus on their content.
2. Using operational guidelines, to observe each project to identify successes, problems, and discrepancies between those guidelines and the actual implementation of the program.
3. Asking each person participating in the project to maintain a log of successes, problems, and discrepancies between guidelines and actual implementation.
4. Preparing a summary report of process observations.

In this case, the evaluation was limited primarily to step 1, establishing detailed operational guidelines. There were three reasons for this. First, this project presented the unusual problem that three of its four goals were to be implemented after the August 31, 1974, termination of project and evaluation funds. A second factor which limited the extent of the evaluation was its brief duration. Developing operational guidelines was a slow, laborious project which was not finalized before that two month period ended. Finally, the Director of Federal Projects expressed a strong interest in the development of operational guidelines for this program.

To summarize, the evaluation presented here is only the first step in a total assessment of the Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program. Focusing on the development of operational guidelines, it will present, first, a description of the project. A copy of the guidelines in use as of August 31, 1974, and a summary of issues yet unresolved among persons responsible for the project. In addition, some attempt will be made to compare implementation

to the project proposal for those activities completed prior to September 4, 1974.

Project Description

According to the Title I Part C application for grant, the purpose of the Criterion Referenced Testing Program was to produce a computational math skills testing program for Title I children in grades K-6. Major characteristics of the instrument to be developed were (a) that it be keyed to instructional objectives for each strand and grade level of mathematics and (b) that it include alternative forms of test items.

However, once project funds had been granted and plans for implementation were underway, three additional goals were identified. They were:

1. To identify Title I children in mathematics
2. To provide evaluation of progress of identified Title I children.
3. To evaluate math programs used in the 1974-75 school year.

Specific activities related to each of these goals and persons responsible for them are outlined in the operational guidelines that follow.

Title I, Part C

Mathematics Criterion Reference Testing Program

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: Project Management **Page** 1

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	RESOURCE ALLOCATION			
	Personnel			
	Selection			
	Select project leader		5/13/74	Ross Taylor
	Select resource teacher		5/13/74	Ross Taylor
	Select 15 resource teachers		6/7/74	Dennis Lander
	Select 49 classroom teachers		6/7/74	Dennis Lander
	Select secretary		6/17/74	Dennis Lander
	Payment			
	Submit service reports for payment of teachers on special assignment.	Every two weeks	Every two weeks	Dennis Lander
	Submit general requisition forms for payment of resource and classroom teachers.	7/26/74	By 7/26/74	Dennis Lander
	Budget			
	Maintain project budget	As needed	As needed	Paul Larson
	PROJECT PLANNING			
	Identify project decision maker needs and expectations	?	?	Principals' Advisory group on Part C
	Clarify workshop goals	6/18/74	6/18/74	Barbara Bellair
	Develop outline of project activities anticipated completion dates, and persons responsible for each.	6/18/74	6/18/74	Dennis Lander
	Secure consensus on operational guidelines with project decision makers and participants.	7/3/74	Not completed	
	PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION			
	Supervision			
	Contact each program participant to make sure that he (a) understands his responsibilities and (b) is able to fulfill them.	As needed	As needed	Dennis Lander
	Observe daily progress of project to identify problems and discrepancies between the project plan and actual implementation. Use this information to modify project implementation or plans.	Daily	Daily	Dennis Lander

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: Development of Testing Instruments Page 2

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Identify Math Objectives for Grades 1 to 6			
	Form a pool of math objectives for grades 1 to 6 from: the Michigan Minimal Math Objectives, state and national assessments, SRA Systems Math Program, Houghton Mifflin Individual Math Program, and others.		6/21/74	Dennis Lander
	Teachers representing a city-wide scope will identify desired behavioral objectives for all children participating in the 1 to 6 math program	6/28/74	6/28/74	Dennis Lander
	Eight teachers at each grade level will rate each objective identified on a five point scale as to whether it should be included in the assessment package.	7/18/74	7/18/74	Dennis Lander
	Tabulate ratings	7/23/74	7/23/74	Dennis Lander
	Review ratings; determine which objectives should be included within each content strand and each grade level	7/26/74	7/26/74	Dennis Lander
	Write Test Items			
	Small groups of teachers will write 4 test items for each objective	7/5/74	7/5/74	Dennis Lander
	As the objectives are written each group will share its items with other groups to gather opinions about whether the test items actually measure the objectives as intended	7/5/74	7/5/74	Dennis Lander
	Assemble Testing Package			
	A small team will package the objectives and test items: a. Set page formats b. Identify manipulative materials c. Collect manipulative materials d. Supervise typing and production e. Assemble packages	9/1/74	NA	Dennis Lander
	A small team will develop a plan (who is tested, how, what additional testing may be needed) for testing children in mid September, 1974,	7/15/74	6/26/74	Dennis Lander

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Component: Identification of Title I Children Page 3

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	*Test all children in each Title I building to determine achievement of math objectives.	10/15/74	NA	Barb Bellaire
	*Recommend that children who score one grade level or more below their assigned level receive Title I assistance.	10/15/74	NA	Barb Bellaire

*Activity unresolved among all persons bearing responsibility for the project.

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Evaluation of 1974-75
Component: Title I Math Achievement **Page** 4

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	In spring 1975 test Title I children with a parallel form of the math test administered in September, 1974.	Spring 1975	NA	Barb Bellaire
	Determine the amount of growth for each child during the 1974-75 school year.	9/1/75	NA	Barb Bellaire

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Evaluation of
Component: Alternative Math Program **Page** 5

Operation Number	Activity	Anticipated Completion Date or Frequency	Actual Completion Date or Frequency	Person Responsible
	Compare test scores between each commercial math program being used in Minneapolis Public Schools and the currently adopted Houghton Mifflin Modern Math and Structure and Use program.			Barb Bellaire
	*Compare test scores among commercial math programs used in Title I schools in Minneapolis.			Barb Bellaire

Summary of Findings

Development of operational guidelines. Probably the single greatest value of operational guidelines is that their development requires consensus with the content from each person involved. That is, each person with responsibility for the project must agree that the guidelines are an adequate reflection of both the design and the intent of the project.

From the outset of the Mathematics Criterion Referenced Testing Program, it was evident that this project was a complex one with a number of potential implications for future Title I placement and programming. Because this project was so intertwined with and in a sense limited by the Title I program in operation, the development of operational guidelines was a difficult and intensive task. Guidelines were first drafted by the evaluator from the project proposal and goal statements. Then they were reworked item by item in meetings with the project leader, Dennis Lander. Copies of the version that emerged were shared with the math consultants by the project leader and with the Federal Projects Office by the evaluator. Following is a brief summary of reactions to the guidelines that were submitted.

Generally speaking, consensus was reached on goals one and three. Decision makers from the Federal Projects Office and the Mathematics consultants came quickly to an agreement on both the type of pre testing instruments to be developed and the process for developing it. Likewise, there was no apparent disagreement with that instrument being used pre and post to measure growth in computational math skills for each Title I child during the 1974-75 school year.

For both goal two and goal four issues were identified which prevented total acceptance of the guidelines by one or more of the persons responsible for the project. Goal two was "to identify Title I children in mathematics." The problem identified here was primarily an operational one. According to Title I regulations, children are designated as Title I by total educational disadvantage, not by individual content areas. In other words, the concept identifying "Title I math students" was in conflict with the definition of Title I. Still it was noted that the instrument developed could provide helpful input into the total identification process. Several alternatives were cited:

a. Scores from the criterion referenced instrument could replace the standardized math scores currently used,
b. Results of the instrument could be used as input for classroom teachers in making judgments about the rating of each child, or
c. The instrument could be used to diagnose children once they have been identified as Title I according to the current operational procedures.

Goal 4, to evaluate math programs used in the 1974-75 school year was expressed as a concern by the project leader. The concern was for individual teachers who would be personally identified with a number of alternative math programs being used. There was some indication from both Federal Projects and the project leader that a meeting to discuss these matters would be helpful. However, such a meeting had not been scheduled when the funding period ended.

Implementation of Operational Guidelines. As explained in previous sections, activities related to goal one were the only ones scheduled for completion before project funding terminated. Stratifying math objectives, writing test items, and assembling testing packages all seemed to be implemented and completed according to the project plan.

Recommendations

Based on observations made during the first phase of the Criterion Referenced Mathematics Testing Program, the following recommendation seems particularly important:

> The federal Projects Office and the Mathematics consultants should seek to resolve issues related to goals 2 and 4 in the operational guidelines.

It seems advisable, too, to suggest that:

> The development of operational guidelines in future Title I projects might be facilitated by a joint meeting of project decision makers so that persons with responsibility for the project could respond to a proposed draft and work through potential conflict.

APPENDIX A

Opinionnaire
Title I Part C East Area In-Service

DIRECTIONS: Please check (✓) the appropriate line to provide the following information:

Classification of your participation in this in-service: _____(1)teacher; _____(2) aide; _____(3)parent; _____(4)other

School name (1974-75) _____

Type of organization you worked with last year: _____(1)traditional; _____(2)continuous progress; _____(3)open; _____(4)other

Type of organization you will be working with next year: _____(1)traditional; _____(2)continuous progress; _____(3)open; _____(4)other

Previous experience with Title I children: _____(1)3 yrs or more; _____(2)1 to 3 yrs; _____(3)less than 1 yr; _____(4)none

* * * DIRECTIONS * * *

Listed below are each of the content areas covered in this East Area Title I in-service.

Using this scale: 1 very low; 2 low; 3 average; 4 high; 5 very high

please rate each component of the in-service on:

- Your need for knowledge in the content area prior to the in-service
- Your level of satisfaction with what you learned
- Your desire for more in-service in this area

If you did not attend a session listed, leave the spaces blank.

Content Area	Need for knowledge prior to in-serv.	Level of satis-faction	Desire for more in-serv.
FEDERAL PROJECTS			
Services of Federal Projects Office 7/8			
Explanation of Title I 7/8			
Current Title I projects 7/8			
Use of Title I materials 7/8			
Instructional Materials Center (IMC) 7/8			
The aides' program 7/8			
Title I objectives and evaluation 7/11			
Title I needs assessment 7/11			
READING			
Dr. M. Vere DeVault's presentation on Strategies and Systems for Individualizing Reading Instruction 7/9			
Language experience techniques for primary children 7/12			
Language experience techniques for intermediate children 7/12			
Moffett interaction program for primary children 7/12			
Moffett interaction for intermediate children 7/12			
Interest surveys and diagnostic tools for primary students 7/15			
Interest surveys and diagnostic tools for intermediate students 7/15			
Commercial reading materials 7/16			
Reading comprehension techniques 7/16			

Content Area	Need for knowledge prior to in-serv.	Level of satis-faction	Desire for more in-serv.
MATHEMATICS			
Individualizing Instruction			
Dr. M. Vere DeVault's presentation on Strategies for Individualizing Math Instruction 7/10			
CGAM and CAI as tools for individualizing 7/10			
Using diagnosis kits to assist in individualizing the Houghton Mifflin Math program. 7/10			
An example of how an individualized math program functions 7/10			
An example of an assessment tool to use in the individualizing process 7/10			
How to write behavioral objectives 7/17			
Critiquing objectives from various sources 7/17			
Math Materials			
Games (Say and Play) 7/18			
Activity cards (See and Do) 7/18			
Films and tapes (See and Hear) 7/18			
Drill materials (Write and Practice) 7/18			

Research and Evaluation Department
July 1974

Are there other topics which you feel should be included in Future Title I in-service training? _____ If so, please list them here in priority order.

Other comments about the in-service?

For aides and teachers only:

Do you have any concerns about the aide-teacher team in your school setting next year? _____ If so, please describe them here.

As an aide or a teacher who will be working with an aide, do you feel that further in-service training will be necessary? _____ Please explain.

Opinionnaire

Title I Part C North Area In-Service

DIRECTIONS: Please check (✓) the appropriate line to provide the following information

1 Classification of your participation in this in-service: ____(1) teacher; ____(2) aide; ____(3) parent; ____(4) other

2 Type of organization you worked with last: ____(1) traditional; ____(2) continuous progress; ____(3) open; ____(4) other

3 Type of organization you will be working with this year: ____(1) traditional; ____(2) continuous progress; ____(3) open; ____(4)other

4 Previous experience with Title I children: ____(1) 3 years or more; ____(2) 1 to 3 years; ____(3) less than 1 year; ____(4) none

5 - 7 School name (1974-75)_____

DIRECTIONS

Listed below are each of the content areas covered in this North Area Title I in-service.

Using this scale: 1 very low; 2 low; 3 average; 4 high; 5 very high

please rate each component on the in-service on:

- Your need for knowledge in the content area prior to the in-service
- Your level of satisfaction with what you learned
- Your desire for more in-service in this area

If you did not attend a session listed, leave the spaces blank.

Content Area	Need for knowledge prior to in-service	Level of satis-faction	Desire for more in-service
FEDERAL PROJECTS			
8 - 10 Services of Federal Projects Office			
11 - 13 Explanation of Title I			
14 - 16 Use of Title I materials			
17 - 19 Instructional Materials Center (IMC)			
20 - 22 The aides' program			
23 - 25 Title I objectives and evaluation			
26 - 28 Current Title I Projects			
29 - 31 Title I needs assessment			
32 - 34 Orientation to the Title I child			
35 - 37 Assessing without threatening: Reading and Math			
38 - 40 Learning materials that motivate and encourage			
41 - 43 Self-concept: A process approach			
45 - 47 Perceptual motor development			
48 - 50 Developing a successful teacher and aide team			

Research and Evaluation Department
August 1974

Are there other topics which you feel should be included in Future Title I in-service training?_____
If so, please list them here in priority order.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Other comments about the in-service?_____

_____

_____

_____

For aides and teachers only:

Do you have any concerns about the aide-teacher team in your school setting next year?_____
If so, please describe them here._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

As an aide or a teacher who will be working with an aide, do you feel that further in-service training will be necessary?_____ Please explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Opinionnaire

Title I Part C West Area In-Service

DIRECTIONS: Please check (✓) the appropriate line to provide the following information

1 Classification of your participation in this in-service: ____(1) teacher; ____(2) aide; ____(3) parent; ____(4) other

2 Type of organization you worked with last: ____(1) traditional; ____(2) continuous progress; ____(3) open; ____(4) other

3 Type of organization you will be working with this year: ____(1) traditional; ____(2) continuous progress; ____(3) open; ____(4) other

4 Previous experience with Title I children: ____(1) 3 years or more; ____(2) 1 to 3 years; ____(3) less than 1 year; ____(4) none

5 - 7 School name (1974-75)_____

D I R E C T I O N S

Listed below are each of the content areas covered in this West Area Title I in-service.

Using this scale: 1 very low, 2 low, 3 average, 4 high, 5 very high

please rate each component on the in-service on:

- Your need for knowledge in the content area prior to the in-service
- Your level of satisfaction with what you learned
- Your desire for more in-service in this area

If you did not attend a session listed, leave the spaces blank.

Content Area	Need for knowledge prior to in-service	Level of satis-faction	Desire for more in-service
FEDERAL PROJECTS			
8 - 10 Services of Federal Projects Office			
11 - 13 Explanation of Title I			
14 - 16 Use of Title I materials			
17 - 19 Instructional Materials Center (IMC)			
20 - 22 The aides' program			
23 - 25 Title I objectives and evaluation			
26 - 28 Current Title I Projects			
29 - 31 Title I needs assessment			

Content Area	Need for knowledge prior to in-service	Level of satis-faction	Desire for more in-service
30 - 34 The black family, a comparative analysis			
35 - 37 Value elicitation experience			
38 - 40 Survival techniques of students			
41 - 43 Socio-metric techniques for schools			
44 - 46 Community-Parent Teacher-Dialogue			
47 - 49 The concept of self-concept			
50 - 52 Behavioral objectives			
53 - 55 The life space interview			
56 - 58 Affective behavioral objectives			

Research and Evaluation Department
August 1974

Are there other topics which you feel should be included in Future Title I in-service training?_____
If so, please list them here in priority order.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Other comments about the in-service?_____

_____

_____

_____

For aides and teachers only:

Do you have any concerns about the aide-teacher team in your school setting next year?_____
If so, please describe them here._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

As an aide or a teacher who will be working with an aide, do you feel that further in-service training will be necessary?_____ Please explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Minneapolis Public Schools

Educational Services Division

Planning, Development and Federal Programs

Harry N. Vakos, PhD., Assistant Superintendent

Educational Services

Planning and Development

Lawrence P. Moon, PhD., Director of Planning, Development and Federal Programs

Mary C. Kasbohm, Assistant Director of Planning, Development and Federal Programs

Wallace J. Spolar, Fiscal Manager

Emma N. Hudson, Coordinator, Title I ESEA

Ruby M. Riney, Coordinator, Title I ESEA

Marge Hols, Dissemination Specialist

Rebecca S. Howard, Dissemination Specialist

Research and Evaluation

Richard W. Faunce, PhD., Director of Research and Evaluation

Lary R. Johnson, Research Associate

Robert L. Bergeth, PhD., Title I Evaluator

Sara H. Clark, Title I Evaluator

Bonna Nesset, Administrative Assistant

Thomas McCormick, Title I Research Assistant